



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# JOURNAL

OF THE

## ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.

---

ART. XVI.—*An Inquiry into the Fate of the Ten Tribes of Israel after the Fall of Samaria; with a View of the History of the Assyrian Empire at that period, as derived from a comparison of what is recorded on the subject in the Histories of the Jews, the Greeks, and the Persians.* By the late T. M. DICKINSON, Esq., Secretary of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.

Read January 7th, 1837.

### PART I.

ON THE ANCIENT HISTORY OF ASSYRIA AND PERSIA; AS CONNECTED WITH THE DESTRUCTION OF THE KINGDOM OF ISRAEL.

THE points discussed in the following pages, are the subject of an inquiry into which I was led, some time ago, by finding in the writings of an Arabian geographer, mention made of several places, which attracted my attention from their agreement in name with those to which we read that the Israelites were carried, when Samaria was destroyed by the armies of Assyria. Knowing that it was still a matter of doubt where the captives of Israel were placed, and finding in all that had been written on the subject, nothing which appeared satisfactory or conclusive, I was curious to ascertain, whether, in a case so authentic and so interesting, something like certainty could not be elicited by reflection and research; which led to an inquiry, somewhat longer than I anticipated, which forms the subject of the following pages.

I found in the very outset of my inquiry that it involved, and indeed essentially demanded, a careful consideration of the political state of the Assyrian empire, at the time of the captivity; a subject which, more perhaps than any other, has exercised the research and ingenuity of the learned, has been dimmed by clouds of learning

and criticism, and buried in a darkness not its own. It is true that in the sources from which our information regarding the history of Assyria is drawn, there are many differences and apparent contradictions, sufficient, at first sight, to warrant an idea that the several accounts are utterly discordant and at variance with each other; and as the period to which they refer is one that stands at the farthest verge of historical record, obscured and almost lost in the dark shade of extreme antiquity, we cannot be surprised that men who were studious and ardent in the investigation of all that relates to these ancient times, should, when excited by the great interest of the subject, have been beguiled from the way of truth and history, into the wide field of speculation and conjecture; that in their desire of explaining what they did not understand, they allowed their judgment to follow their imagination—and thus, on the assumption of a contradiction in history, thought themselves at liberty to adopt any probable conjecture, or hypothesis, which would reconcile the apparent discrepancies of their subject, and free them from the many imaginary difficulties, by which they found themselves so seriously perplexed.

The accounts which are preserved of the Assyrian empire, are chiefly referable to three great sources,—the histories of the Hebrews, the Greeks, and the Persians; and it has generally been supposed that these three histories, in all that relates to the affairs of Assyria, are at variance with each other, and in some cases also, inconsistent in themselves. It has, therefore, been the endeavour of several writers, to reconcile these apparent discrepancies and contradictions; but so numerous and so different are the systems they have pursued, so unscrupulous have they been in rejecting and falsifying whatever opposed their own views or opinions, that the subject has come to be regarded as a question of curious but useless speculation and conjecture—a subject on which anything may be surmised, but which cannot be brought to a satisfactory conclusion. I shall endeavour in the first part of this inquiry to show that these histories, if taken in a plain and literal sense, are not contradictory to, or at variance with, each other; that on the contrary, the leading features agree in all, in a manner so remarkable, as to afford a strong argument in favour of the general truth of all. And I hope to prove, that if so viewed together, they will be found to explain and to elucidate each other, and to throw much light on a portion of very ancient Oriental history, which at present is involved in great obscurity.

To commence with the Greek accounts of Assyria. We know of two Greek historians only, who have written on the subject of Assy-

rian history, on the authority of their own personal researches. The one was Herodotus, "who drew his materials from records which respected the national crown of the Medes," about the middle of the fifth century before the Christian era. The other was Ctesias,<sup>1</sup> who compiled his history from the Archives, which contained the successions on the imperial throne of the successors of Ninus, about the end of the same century. It is generally supposed that these two histories are at variance, and not to be reconciled with each other; and it will, therefore, be my first endeavour to show the incorrectness of this opinion.

We learn from Ctesias, as he is quoted by Diodorus, Eusebius, Syncellus, and other chronologists, that a long and continued dynasty of kings, from Ninus, who built the walls of Nineveh, to Sardanapalus, the last of the Assyrian family, swayed the sceptre of Western Asia for upwards of 1,300 years. That in the reign of Sardanapalus, about 821 years *n. c.*,<sup>2</sup> a revolution was effected in the Assyrian

<sup>1</sup> To those who doubt the veracity of Ctesias, and deny his authority on historical questions, I would recommend a candid and unbiassed consideration of the circumstances under which he wrote his history, and of the arguments in favour of his general veracity adduced by Stephanus, in whose opinion I fully agree:—"Qui melius, qui certius de rebus Persicis scribere potuerit quam Ctesias, arbitror fuisse neminem." From what is recorded by sacred and profane authors, we have reason to believe that the Chronicles of the Kings of Assyria and of Persia were written and preserved with the greatest attention. See Ctesias, Herodotus, Moses of Chorene, and the books of Ezra, Esther, &c., &c. "Such," observes Van Heeren, "was the origin of the Chronicles or Diaries of the Persians, which, being deposited in the principal cities of the empire, Susa, Babylon, and Ecbatana, formed what were called the Archives of the kingdom. A history compiled of such materials, would necessarily be a history of *the Court*, rather than of the empire; and fragments of Ctesias serve to confirm this idea,"—*Hist. Researches*. This should be borne in mind throughout the following pages.

<sup>2</sup> This date is made out as follows:—

It is stated by Diodorus, on the authority of Ctesias, that there were ten kings, inclusive, from Arbaces to Cyrus, viz. :—

1. Arbaces, reigned	. . . . .	28 years.
2. Mandaucus	. . . . .	20
3. Sosarmus	. . . . .	30
4. Artychas	. . . . .	30
5. Arbaces	. . . . .	22
6. Arkeus	. . . . .	40
7. Artynas	. . . . .	22
8. Astybaras	. . . . .	40
9. Aspadas, or Astyages.	. . . . .	35
10. Cyrus		

Total Years, 267.

It is

empire, by Arbaces, a Mede, at the instigation, and with the aid, of Belesys, a Babylonian, which ended in the capture and destruction of Nineveh, the death of Sardanapalus, and the elevation of Arbaces, a Median prince, to the vacant throne of the successors of Ninus. From this period, Diodorus informs us, from the same authority, that the Median supremacy was established in the East, and continued in the hands of Arbaces, and his successors, for a period of 267 years, through nine generations, down to Aspadas, whom the Greeks called Astyages, whose reign was terminated by the conquests of Cyrus, which raised the newly established kingdom of Persia to the supremacy of the nations of Western Asia.

From Herodotus we learn, that after the Assyrians had been in possession of Upper Asia for 520 years, the Medes revolted, and succeeded in shaking off the yoke of Assyria. That they remained for some time in the enjoyment of a state of wild independence, without the control of any sovereign authority, till 710 years before the Christian era;<sup>1</sup>

It is to be observed with regard to this list, that in the present editions of Diodorus's works, the duration of the reigns of Mandaucæ and Artycles, is given as fifty years for each. But Syncellus and Eusebius, who both wrote on the same authority, agree in assigning the shorter periods, which are here adopted. The duration of the reign of Astyages is not given by Diodorus; it is, therefore, taken on the authority of Herodotus.

Now the beginning of the reign of Cyrus the Great, is generally placed at the year *n. c.* 559. It is, however, probable that this refers to the period when Cyrus was placed at the head of the Persian armies, when they rose against the Median king; and that it was some time before he was strong enough to depose Astyages. I will, therefore, take, with Dr. Russell, the year 654, as the last year of the reign of Astyages, which, added to 267, the sum of the nine reigns above detailed, gives the year *n. c.* 821, as the date of the accession of Arbaces the Mede, to the throne of Sardanapalus.—See several authorities in support of this, in *Russell's Connexion of Sacred and Profane History*, Book II. c. 1.

<sup>1</sup> This date is taken from Diodorus Siculus, who says, Lib. II. p. 118, that the revolt of the Medes under Deioeces, as related by Herodotus, occurred in the second year of the seventeenth Olympiad, which corresponds with the year *n. c.* 710. Herodotus has assigned two different periods for the duration of the Median power, and the reigns of the Median kings, which I do not think has been clearly explained. He gives a list of four kings of Media, from Deioeces to Astyages, who was deposed by Cyrus, and makes the sum of their reigns amount to 160 years. In another place he says, that the Median power fell before Cyrus, after it had subsisted 128 years; exclusive of a period of twenty-eight years, during which he tells us the Scythians held possession of Upper Asia; making thereby an interval of 156 years from the accession of Deioeces to the defeat of Astyages, by Cyrus and the Persians. Now the proper explanation of these seeming incongruities, appears to me discernible from a careful attention to the words of Herodotus. It is more than probable, that Cyrus was invested with the royal title in his native country, before he had won the sceptre of the Medes. During this interval, Astyages was still the

when, to save their country from anarchy and ruin, they elected Deioeces to be their king. Deioeces established himself at Ecbatana, which he henceforth made the capital of his kingdom, and persuaded his countrymen to enclose it with walls. After a reign of fifty-three years, he died, and was succeeded by his son Phraortes, who, after a brilliant and successful career, during which he is said to have defeated the Persians, and to have overrun a considerable portion of Asia, was vanquished and killed by the Assyrians of Nineveh, after a reign of twenty-two years. He was succeeded on the throne by Cyaxares, who invaded Assyria, and had shut up the Assyrians within the walls of Nineveh, when his career was stopped by the invasion of a horde of Scythians from the north, who defeated the Medes, and occupied the country for twenty-eight years; when they were at length driven out by Cyaxares, who thereupon renewed operations against Nineveh, and revenged his father's death, by the capture of the capital, and the final destruction of the Assyrian empire. He reigned forty years, (including the twenty-eight of the Scythian ascendancy,) and was succeeded by Astyages, the last of the Medes; who, after a reign of thirty-five years, was vanquished and deposed by Cyrus the Persian, who thereby raised his native country to the supreme power of Upper Asia, which the Medes had enjoyed for a period of 128 years.

Such is a brief and faithful summary of the circumstances related by Ctesias and Herodotus, regarding the ancient history of Assyria, which embraces nearly all the points which have given rise to the various opinions in which the subject is involved and obscured. As the leader of a great Median revolt, some writers have thought it necessary to identify Arbaces with the Deioeces of Herodotus; others have supposed him to be Cyaxares, as the captor of Nineveh, and subverter of the ancient empire of Assyria; while others have adopted other suppositions, differing from the preceding in every point,

king of Media, and the Medes, till their defeat, were the paramount power in Upper Asia. But in writing a chronological list of kings, in which Cyrus succeeds Astyages, either the first years of the reign of Cyrus, or the last years of that of Astyages, must be omitted; or the chronology deducible from the two together would be incorrect. If then we suppose that the sum of the four Median kings of Herodotus, commencing in the year B. C. 710, and amounting to 150 years, ended with the first regnal year of Cyrus, we shall have for the date of that event the year B. C. 560, which exactly corresponds with the received chronology. But the Median power, which is not introduced in a chronological series, actually continued until it fell before Cyrus, in 554, as above stated. Its duration, therefore, counting from the establishment of the Median kingdom, in B. C. 710, would be exactly 156 years, as it is correctly represented by Herodotus.—See *Diod. Sic., Herod.*

except in their total discrepancy with each other, and with the sources from which they profess to be derived.

Now, it is certain that, if we would attach any degree of authority to the accounts of these two Greek historians, we cannot identify the dynasty of Ctesias with that of Herodotus; that is, a dynasty of nine kings, founded 821 years *n. c.*, and continued for 267 years, with a dynasty of four kings, founded only 710 years *n. c.*, the sum of whose reigns did not exceed 156 years, at most. Still it is evident that the last two kings in both dynasties were the same, from the circumstance of the former of them reigning forty years, and holding his court within the walls of Ecbatana; and being moreover the father of the latter, who was the Astyages, king of Media, whose empire was subverted by Cyrus the Persian, as recorded by both Herodotus and Ctesias. We must, therefore, consider, First,—Who were these two different dynasties? and where did they reign? And, Secondly,—How comes it, that they should both terminate with the same two princes?

Whatever may have been the expression of Ctesias, regarding the capture of Nineveh, by Arbaces, 821 years before the Christian era, it is certain that the ancient capital of Assyria was not utterly and for ever destroyed on the occasion of that momentous revolution. For not only does Herodotus positively assert, that Phraortes was destroyed by the Assyrians of Nineveh, and that Nineveh was besieged and taken by Cyaxares, in the eighth century before the Christian era, but all the Hebrew histories concur, in stating that the first invasion of the Assyrians into Israel, was subsequent to the year 769 *n. c.*, when Menahem ascended the throne of Samaria, from which time their inroads were continually repeated, till the year 719 *n. c.*, when Israel was carried away into Assyria. It follows, that, the dynasty of the Arbacidæ, as recorded by Ctesias, though called Median from the circumstance of the founder being a Mede, still, as being possessed of supreme power in Upper Asia, can be no other than that to which the Hebrew historians allude in all their relations of the kings of Assyria, whose capital was the great city of Nineveh. On the other hand the dynasty of Herodotus, were, as he clearly and expressly states, kings of the Medes, who, about 710 years *n. c.*, threw off their allegiance to the sovereigns of Nineveh, and elected Deioeces to be their king. This led to constant wars between the Medes and Assyrians. In one campaign, Phraortes, the son of Deioeces, was slain; but his death was revenged by his son Cyaxares, who conquered the Assyrians, destroyed Nineveh, and seized on the ancient sceptre of Ninus—torn from the weak grasp of the successors of

Arbaces, to deck the throne of the kings of Media. But Media was not long destined to enjoy the proud elevation to which the sword of Cyaxares had raised it; his son Astyages yielded to the rising fortunes of Cyrus, when the newly acquired sceptre of the Eastern world was transferred to the sway of the kings of Persia.

Here, then, we find the records of two different Median dynasties, and discover the reason why the last two kings of Media, as recorded by Herodotus, are also included in the list of Ctesias. The records to which this author had access, contained the list of all those monarchs, who had, from the most remote period of antiquity, enjoyed the supremacy of Western Asia; of whom the Persians, when they had raised themselves to the supreme power, would justly consider themselves the successors. So long as the empire of Assyria existed, the Medes and their princes were regarded as rebels in arms against their lawful sovereigns. Deioces, therefore, and his successor Phraortes, would have no place in the chronicles of the kings of Upper Asia. But when Cyaxares, the son of Phraortes, had captured and utterly destroyed Nineveh, and had, by the subversion of the power of Assyria, raised his native country to the rank which Assyria held before; he would, as the sovereign of Upper Asia, be entitled to a place in those records, from which Ctesias compiled his history; and would be included also in the list of Herodotus, as a successor of Deioces, on the throne of Media. For the same reason also, Astyages, the son and successor of Cyaxares, would have a place in the list of both historians; and hence the circumstance of the dynasties of both terminating with the same two individuals.

This view of the subject will be simplified and illustrated by the following

TABLE:—SHOWING THE SERIES OF KINGS PRECEDING CYRUS THE GREAT, AS RECORDED BY CTESIAS AND HERODOTUS.

CTESIAS.		HERODOTUS.	
DYNASTY AND NUMBER OF KINGS.		DYNASTY AND NUMBER OF KINGS.	Began to Reign.
Assyrian Empire.	I. ASSYRIAN OF NINEVEH.		B. C.
	No. 1. Ninus .....		2126
	31 or 36 Kings, to 36 Sardanapalus, overthrown by Arbaces .....		821
		Media subjected to Assyria for 520 years .....	1341
	II. MEDIAN OF NINEVEH		
	No. 37. Arbaces .....	Medes revolt from Assyria...	821
	7 Kings, to 43 Artynes, overthrown by Cyaxares .....	1. No. 1. Deioces elected King .....	710
		2. Phraortes.....	657



DYNASTY AND NUMBER OF KINGS.		Began to Reign.	DYNASTY AND NUMBER OF KINGS.	Began to Reign.
Median Empire.	III. MEDIAN OF ECBATANA.	B. C.	KINGS OF MEDIA & ASSYRIA.	B. C.
	No. 44. Cyaxares, or Astyages .....	629	3. Cyaxares .....	633
	2 Kings to 45 Astyages, or Aspadas, overthrown by Cyrus .....	554	4. Astyages .....	593
Persian Empire.	IV. PERSIAN.		II.	
	No. 46. Cyrus the Great 10 Kings to 53 Artaxerxes Mnemon, in whose court Ctesias lived.....	554 404	5. Cyrus the Great, &c....	559

The difference of six years between these lists has already been explained in Note 1, p. 220.

IN support of the system which is here pursued for reconciling the accounts of Herodotus and Ctesias, I avail myself of the authority and arguments of Dr. Russell, exhibited in Book ii., c. 1., of his very able work on the Connexion of Sacred and Profane History, in which the objections to the several systems of Hales, Marsham, Usher, Drummond, Prideaux, Jackson, and others, are briefly but most satisfactorily exposed. The opinions of the more ancient chronologists and historians who have treated on the ancient history of Assyria, as Eusebius, Africanus, Polyhistor, Abidenus, Syncellus, &c., have been collected, with immense industry and research, in the Appendix of Clinton's *Fasti Hellenici*, c. 3 and 4, "On the ancient Kings of Media and Assyria;" and to those able works, and to the authorities therein quoted and controverted, I must refer those who would enter more fully into the details of the question, while I proceed to examine those legends and traditions which are preserved in the pages of Oriental history, which, though meagre in its details of all that relates to these ancient times, and partly obscured by fable and hyperbole, has retained in its outline so striking a likeness to the leading features of the Greek accounts, that I cannot but regard it as a strong argument in favour of the authenticity and correctness of both.

It is supposed that the ancient histories of Persia were lost or destroyed in the troubled period which followed the Mohammedan invasion of Irán. Our earliest authority is, therefore, brought down to Abu Jafer ben Jarir, better known as Al Tabari, who wrote a work on Universal History about the beginning of the tenth century of the Christian era. This work was chiefly compiled at Bagdad, and was written in Arabic; a Persian translation being the book now known as the *Taríkh i Tabari*. I am disposed, however, for many reasons, to prefer the authority of the great poet and historian of

Persia, Firdousi, of Tús, in Khorasan, who wrote the *Shah Namah* about the beginning of the eleventh century, in which we have every reason to believe that he embodied all the information procurable from old manuscripts, songs, legends, and traditions respecting the ancient history of Persia.<sup>1</sup>

According to Firdousi, the sovereignty of Persia was enjoyed in very ancient times by a dynasty generally known as the Paishdadian, which was founded by Kaiomars,<sup>2</sup> the first king of Persia, and continued for a period of 800 years, when it was attacked and overthrown in the person of Jamshíd, by an invasion of foreigners from the direction of Mesopotamia. This invasion was conducted by one Zohák,<sup>3</sup> the son of Mirdas, the king of the Tázis, as Firdousi calls them, who, at the invitation of a party in Irán, whom the tyranny of Jamshíd had driven into revolt, led an army into Persia, and, aided by a party of the Persian nobility, expelled Jamshíd, whom he afterwards slew, and seized upon the throne of the Paishdadian kings, which he (and his successors) are said to have retained for a period which is stated at a thousand years. At length Persia was delivered from bondage by the gallantry and conduct of a native chief named Feridún,<sup>4</sup> who rose against Zohák, and after a series of

<sup>1</sup> While treating of the Oriental accounts of Persia, I wish it to be understood that I intend, by that name, the whole country called by the modern Persians Irán. Of the Medes I am not aware of any mention being made in Oriental history. I consider them to have been a powerful tribe of the same stock as the Persians of Fars, whose name has gradually fallen into disuse since the time when Cyrus raised his native country to the highest rank amongst the nations of Irán.

<sup>2</sup> The name of Kaiomars appears to be Sanscrit, and signifies "Body of Clay," and he is called by Persian writers Gil Shah, or "King of Clay." The Persians suppose him to be the first created being, which is correct with reference to the extent of their knowledge; for they have no account whatever of the deluge. According to the Dabistan, he is only the first of the fifth dynasty of the kings of Persia.

<sup>3</sup> Other writers call Zohák the son of Shedad, king of Syria.—See the *Zinat al Tawarikh*.

<sup>4</sup> There is a circumstance connected with the history of Feridún, as recorded by the Persians, which I think is well deserving of attention. I allude to the story of the *Dirafsh i Káwán*, the famous Leather Standard of Persia. That such a standard did exist, is proved by the fact of its having been taken by the Arabs, under Saadi Wakas, the general of the Caliph Omar; but the question is, what was its origin? The Persians say it was first borne in the revolt of Feridún (the Arhaces of the Greeks), when he freed his country from the yoke of Assyria. But can it be supposed that a standard of so peculiar a nature should have escaped the notice, not only of Herodotus and Ctesias, but also of Alexander, whose historians have preserved no mention whatever of any such a standard being borne by the Persians. Moreover Xenophon, who fought on the most momentous occasion

brilliant successes, defeated and destroyed the power of the Tazis in a great battle fought near the banks of the Tigris, whereby he not only delivered his country from the foreign yoke and tyranny of Zohák, but raised himself to the head of the vast empire of the Tazi kings, which stretched from Asia Minor, through Mesopotamia and Persia, to Khorasan and Tartary, and the confines of China. Feridún was succeeded by his grandson, Menucheh, who maintained in all its power and dignity the vast empire over which he ruled. But from the accession of his successor Nozar, the power of the Persian kings declined. The country was exposed to continued insults from the warlike and hostile tribes of Turán. In one campaign the unfortunate Nozar was made prisoner and slain by Afrasiab, the famous king of Turán, who ruled over Persia for a period of ten or twelve years. At the end of this time, he appears to have been driven out by Zál, hereditary chief of Seistan, the hero of this portion of Persian history, who raised in succession two kings, named Zow and Kershasp, to fill the vacant throne of Persia. Little is said regarding these princes, whose reigns were short, and not distinguished by any great exploit. Peace indeed seems to have been purchased from Afrasiab, on terms, which the language of Firdousi himself would lead us to suspect were neither honourable nor advantageous to Persia. But the weakness of Kershasp left the country virtually, if not actually, without a king. The people were scattered and without a head, till at length a pressing sense of their danger compelled them to unite and elect a king, when the choice of the nation fell on Kaikobad, the founder of the Kaianian dynasty of Persia.

In viewing this portion of the history of Firdousi, we must bear in mind the circumstances under which that history was compiled. It is almost certain that the list and chronicles of the kings of Persia who reigned before the time of Alexander, were lost or destroyed long before the age of Firdousi, and that nothing was left to the people of Persia but the remembrance of those broad outlines of their history, which were sufficiently marked to fix on the memory, and to preserve in some measure a sort of connexion be-

that ever summoned a king of Persia to the field, expressly says that the standard of the empire was a golden eagle. And so says Q. Curtius. I consider that the Persians have made up of facts, which are fundamentally true, a story which is wrong in its application. I think that the hero of the Leather Apron was Artaxerxes, or Ardashir, who subverted the empire of the Parthian kings, and founded the Sassanian dynasty of Persia, A. D. 226, and who was, as Vaillant says, *Cujusdam Persæ viri infimæ sortis, et coriariam quidem exercentis filius*.

tween themselves and the founders of their empire. It is, therefore, not likely that the names and duration of every reign would be preserved of a long dynasty of kings who had obtained a place in the page of history, solely from having sat on the throne of Persia. It is far more probable that the dynasty would be embodied in a single individual under some name, or perhaps only some royal title which was assumed by every king of the series, as the Caesar of the Roman and Pharaoh of the old Egyptian empires. The reigns of Jamshîd, therefore, and of Zohák, may be regarded as a native and foreign dynasty, of which no other details have been preserved, save only that they subsisted, the one for 700, the other for what is termed "a thousand years." With regard to this term we should bear in mind that it is commonly used, in the idiom of Persia, to represent any great and indefinite quantity. Thus the Bulbul is called Hazar Dastán, "of a thousand tales," from the great variety and compass of its notes. So also a large double flower is called Hazar Beng, or the flower of "a thousand leaves," to which many other instances might be added. The thousand years, therefore, of the reign of Zohák, means nothing more than that Persia was subjected to a foreign yoke for a very long but indefinite time.

The statement of Firdousi then, is simply this:—That the Persian monarchy had subsisted for a period of 800 years, when it fell before the arms of a foreign power which came from the west, in the direction of the Tigris, and was called by the name of Tazi, or Arabian.<sup>1</sup> That it remained subject to a foreign rule for a very long

<sup>1</sup> There can be little doubt that these Tazis were Assyrians. Some Persian authors indeed assert that they came from Nineveh; and Firdousi countenances this assertion by saying, that when attacked by Arbaces, they made a final stand on the banks of the Tigris, and were chased by the Persians across that river, which we may therefore suppose to have been in the heart of their native country. It is worthy of remark, though it need not surprise us, that the Persian historians appear to have known nothing of the Assyrian empire under that designation, though it is incorrectly stated by a great Orientalist, that "Mohammedan writers knew nothing of Nineveh." The Arab geographers call it Ninweh, نينوى, and say it was a city of the highest antiquity. The author of the Rouzet el Safa calls it by the same name, and says it was the capital of Mesopotamia. They have preserved, however, distinct accounts of the existence of a great power in ancient times on the banks of the Tigris, and have recorded some circumstances connected therewith, as related in the writings of the Hebrew historians. The invasion of Israel is mentioned, but the leader of it is called Punkun, king of Mesopotamia; and the destruction of the Assyrians before the walls of Jerusalem is described as in the Hebrew, except that by the Persians a wind is represented as the instrument of the Divine wrath employed against the idolatrous hosts of Assyria. With regard to the term Tazi, it is synonymous with Arab, and is applied to men, dogs,

period of years, when it was freed by the gallantry of a native chief named Feridún, who not only delivered his country from bondage, but raised himself to the head of the Tazi empire. That in the course of two or three generations the country fell into a state of confusion, and was for some time without a king, when the people elected a chief named Kaikobad to fill the vacant throne of Persia, who became the founder of a race of kings which subsisted till the time of Alexander the Great.

It is impossible to read this account of Firdousi, without being struck by its near agreement with the statement of the Greeks. By the reign of Zohák is evidently intended the Assyrian dynasty, which ruled over Persia for a period which Herodotus enables us to determine at 520 years. The Feridún of Firdousi, who subverted and usurped the Assyrian power, is thus identified with the Arbaces of Ctesias, which gives, as the time of his elevation to the throne, the year B. C. 821. And the Kaikobad of the Persians, who lived about four generations after Feridún, and was called to the throne by the people of Persia when they felt the want of a sovereign head, is thus identified with the Deioeces of Herodotus, who was raised to the throne of his native country under exactly similar circumstances, in the year 710 before the Christian era.<sup>1</sup>

horses, &c. of Arab extraction. Or the two words it is the most comprehensive, and was applied, I consider, by the ancient Persians to the people of Mesopotamia, Syria, Irak i Arabi, and Arabia, who spoke the Arabic, or some cognate dialect, (which I regard as having been the language of the Assyrians,) in the same manner as the term Feringi is applied indiscriminately to all Europeans, (save those of Turkey,) by the Persian writers of the present day.

<sup>1</sup> With regard to the connexion between the Greek and Persian accounts of the successors of Deioeces or Kaikobad, I would refer to the excellent summary of the Kaianian dynasty of the Persian kings, contained in chap. iv. and vii. of Sir John Malcolm's *History of Persia*. According to this, the Deioeces and Phraortes of the Greek historians are identified with Kaikobad, and a king whose name Firdousi has not recorded, but who is called by the author of the *Majma' al Tawarikh*, by the name of Aphra, which nearly agrees with the Phraortes of the Greeks. The Cyaxares and Astyages of the Greek writers are both represented by the Kaikaus of the Persians, whom some call the son and some the grandson of Kaikobad. Kaikesron, is Cyrus, the founder of the Persian dynasty of the Greeks. From this period we are not able to identify with certainty the succeeding kings till we arrive at Artaxerxes Longimanus of the Greeks, whose name alone is sufficient to identify him with the Ardeshir-Dirazdash, or Long-handed, of the Persians. The interval is filled up by the Greek historians with the reigns of Cambyses, Darius Hystaspes, and Xerxes, and the short usurpation of Smerdis-Magus and Artabanus. Some writers have thought proper to call in question the reigns and exploits of these princes, but their reasons for so doing are very insufficient, and the light lately thrown on this portion of history by the inscriptions on the temples and

These great points being determined, it is easy to account for the apparent discrepancies which appear in the details of the several historians. With regard to the difference between the accounts of Herodotus and Ctesias, it has already been explained by showing that these historians were treating of two separate and distinct dynasties; and this explanation has been confirmed by the authority of the native histories of Persia. But before entering on further details, I will take a brief notice of the history of the Assyrians, as preserved in the sacred writings of the Hebrews.

The Scriptures make no mention of the Assyrians, from the time of their first establishment by Ashur, till the eighth century before the Christian era, if we except the casual notice of them by Balaam when he was called upon to curse the children of Israel,<sup>1</sup> and a king of Mesopotamia, mentioned in the Book of Judges, c. iii. v. 8, whom I consider to be king of Assyria. But about the year 769, when Menahem had seized upon the throne of Samaria, we find it recorded that, "Pul, the king of Assyria, came up against the land, and Menahem gave Pul 1000 talents of silver that his hand might be with him to confirm the kingdom in his hand."<sup>2</sup> Menahem was succeeded by his son Pekahiah, who was slain by the conspiracy of Pekah, the son of Remaliah, the captain of his host, who seized upon the throne B. C. 757. "And in the days of Pekah came Tiglath-pileser, king of Assyria, and took Ijon and Abel-beth-maachah, and Janoah, and Kedesh, and Hazor, and Gilead, and Galilee, all the land of Naphtali, and carried them captive to Assyria."<sup>3</sup> He also went up against Damascus and took it, and carried the people of it captive to Kir, and slew Rezin, the king of Syria.<sup>4</sup> In the year 737, "Hoshea, the son of Elah, made a conspiracy against Pekah, the son of Remaliah, and smote him and slew him, and reigned in his stead."<sup>5</sup> After an interregnum of nine years, "against him came up Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, and Hoshea became his servant,

monuments of Egypt, bear ample testimony to the truth and correctness of the accounts which we have received from the Greek authors. The Persians have preserved the names of two kings only during this period; the first named Lohrasp, whom I consider to be Cambyses, the second Gushtasp, who was probably the Darius of Greek history. The Isfandiari of the Persians, the son of Gushasp, was probably the famous Xerxes of the Greeks. He was probably called Shahinshah, or king of kings; the common title of the kings of Persia, which the Greeks may be supposed to have Hellenized into Xerxes. The Persian *Sh* ش being always represented in Greek by *X*. Herodotus, I know, derives the name from *ἐργετης*, "The Warlike,"

<sup>1</sup> Numbers xxiv. 22, 24.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Kings xv. 19.

<sup>3</sup> 2 Kings xv. 29.

<sup>4</sup> 2 Kings xvi. 9.

<sup>5</sup> 2 Kings xv. 30.

and gave him presents; and the king of Assyria found conspiracy in Hoshea, for he had sent messengers to So, king of Egypt, and brought no present to the king of Assyria as he had done year by year, therefore the king of Assyria shut him up and bound him in prison. Then the king of Assyria came up throughout all the land, and went up to Samaria and besieged it three years. In the ninth year of Hoshea, the king of Assyria took Samaria, and carried Israel away into Assyria, and placed them in Halah, and in Habor by the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes."<sup>1</sup>

Such is a brief summary of the accounts preserved by the kings of Assyria in the Hebrew histories, from the time of their first invasion of Israel, down to the capture of Samaria by Shalmaneser, from which we are enabled to fill up in some measure the imperfect accounts of the Greek historians, who have related but little of the four princes who succeeded Arbaces, except their names and the duration of their reigns.<sup>2</sup> Arbaces, as we have seen, ascended the throne B. C. 821, and was succeeded by Mandaces, the end of whose reign may be placed about the year 773. Of these two princes no mention is made in the Hebrew scriptures, and Ctesias has recorded but little regarding them. He tells us that Arbaces destroyed Nineveh, conferred on Belshazzar the government of Babylonia, and established himself in Ecbatana, all which I see no reason to

<sup>1</sup> 2 Kings xvii. 3—6.

<sup>2</sup> The following passage from Dr. Russell will show the chief points in which I admit, and in which I differ from the authority of his opinion.

"If I be right in this conjecture, it will follow that the four monarchs, who in scripture are called the 'King of Nineveh,' Pul, Tiglath-pileser, and Shalmaneser, and who by Ctesias are denominated Arbaces, Mandaces, Sosarmus, and Artaxerxes, are respectively the same persons; and that they were in fact, Assyrian kings who had sprung from a Median family. As yet Assyria, Babylonia, and Media, were under the same crown, and it was not until the year B. C. 711, that the people of the last-named country, who were dissatisfied with the imperial government, revolted from its authority, and made preparations for the establishment of an independent sovereignty in their own land. After a certain period of anarchy, Deioces was elected king; and at this point commences the Median kingdom properly so called. According to the views which we are now following, there were sovereigns of Median extraction on the throne of Ecbatana, as well as that of Nineveh."

Now according to Dr. Russell (Book ii. chap. 1.) Arbaces ascended the throne of Nineveh B. C. 821, and, after a reign of twenty-eight years, was succeeded by Mandaces, who reigned twenty years. The end of his reign will therefore be about the year B. C. 773. Again, Dr. Russell himself shows (Prelim. Dissert.) that Menahem ascended the throne of Samaria B. C. 769, in whose reign Pul invaded Israel. I consider, therefore, that in the above comparison of the list of Ctesias with the scriptural accounts, Dr. Russell has committed an error, and think that he would himself acknowledge the correctness of the system here advanced.

dispute. We cannot suppose that after such a revolution, the Median usurper found the throne of Ninus an undisturbed possession. There was little, however, to fear in the west, which was awed by the presence and talents of Belesys, whose honour and whose interests were alike engaged to put down any insurrection in the western provinces. But it was otherwise in the eastern parts of the empire, and the central situation of Ecbatana would naturally recommend it to the Median chief, as the place best adapted for his camp and his capital, till he had forced the warlike tribes of the north to acknowledge the successor of their former masters. Whether he remained there for the whole period of his reign, or returned to the ancient capital of the empire, we cannot determine from the records of history. It is probable, however, that both he and Mandaucæ, whom I hold to be the Menucheher of the Persians, were long detained in their Persian provinces, perhaps in reducing the tribes of Turán, which accounts for their celebrity in the annals of Persia, and for the silence of the Hebrew writers respecting them. Mandaucæ was succeeded by his son Sosarmus, who, according to Ctesias, ascended the throne about 773 years *n. c.* Two generations would have amply sufficed to secure and establish the Median dynasty; and hence we might expect, that the same spirit which had raised his fathers to the throne of Assyria, would, when all obstacles were overcome, urge a young king to further conquest.

In perfect conformity with what is here supposed, we find that during the reign of Menahem, which commenced in 769, a king of Assyria invaded Israel. This king is called Pul in Hebrew history, and must, from the time in which he lived, be the same as the Sosarmus of the Greek historian. The next king of Assyria mentioned in Scripture, is called Tiglath-pileser, or Tiglath-pileser, who reduced Syria, invaded Israel, and carried away captive the tribes of Gad and Reuben, and the half-tribe of Manasseh, as recorded in 1 Chron. v. 26. This is generally supposed to have occurred about twenty years before the fall of Samaria, or about the year 740 *n. c.* Now, according to Ctesias, Sosarmus died in 743, and was succeeded by Artychæ, who is thus identified with the Tiglath-pileser of the Hebrews. The next king mentioned, is Shalmaneser, who invaded Israel, and took Samaria, about the year *n. c.* 719, who must, therefore, be identified with the Arbaces of Ctesias, who ascended the throne on the death of Artychæ.

It may, however, be objected to this, that the history of the successors of Feridûn in Persia, according to the records of the native historians, differs entirely from the account here given of the con-



quests of the warlike princes of Nineveh. This difference, I think, may be explained as follows. It has already been shown that I consider the Arbaces and Mandaucæ of Ctesias, to be the Feridûn and Menucheher of Firdousi; and, also, that it is likely they were long engaged in establishing security and peace in Persia. Now Firdousi tells us, that Feridûn, some time before his death, divided his empire among his three sons, leaving to each a separate and independent kingdom. These sons, however, were all cut off in a great civil war, before the death of their father Feridûn, and the empire, therefore, devolved entire upon his grandson and successor, Menucheher. We may hence suppose that this prince adopted a similar policy, (it has been followed by all the greatest conquerors in the East, as may be seen in the instances of Jengiz Khan and Timur,) and that he, perhaps, on his return from Persia, and the restoration of the ancient capital of Assyria, divided his kingdom, which extended from the shores of the Mediterranean, to China, giving Persia to Nozer,<sup>1</sup> and Assyria to Sosarmus, as two separate and distinct principalities. Hence, the Persians, in speaking of the successors of Feridûn and Menucheher, would allude to that branch of the family only, which succeeded to the throne of their native country; whose calamitous career, as related by Firdousi, fully accounts for the state of confusion, which Herodotus and the Persians describe as the cause of the election of Deioces, or Kaikobad. In like manner, Ctesias and the Hebrew writers would have known of no other successors of Mandaucæ, than those who succeeded to the throne of Nineveh. We need not, therefore, be surprised that the accounts of the writers of the Hebrews and the Persians are on this point at variance with each other; nor need we be reduced to the unwarrantable extreme of setting aside and discrediting a grand national history, merely because it differs in some of its details, from another history with which we would identify it, and from which, in great measure, it is separate and distinct.

With regard to the kings who succeeded Shalmaneser on the throne of Nineveh, there is some difficulty in reconciling the accounts of Ctesias and of Scripture, inasmuch as there is nothing recorded by the Greek in any way analogous to the short and disastrous

<sup>1</sup> Firdousi tells us, that Menucheher made Nozer king of Persia before his own death, and recommended him to the counsels of two famous Persian warriors, Sâm and Zâl, in case of an attack from the tribes of Turân, which I think favours the opinion here expressed, that he was himself departing to another part of his empire. Firdousi, however, it must be acknowledged, says he was dying.

reign of Sennacherib, the son and successor of Shalmaneser. According to Scripture, Sennacherib succeeded to the throne of Nineveh about the year B.C., 712, and was assassinated by his sons not long after his return from Israel, about two years after his accession. According to the Greeks, Arbaces was succeeded on the throne by Artæus, who enjoyed a long reign of forty years. Now if we suppose that there was something illegal in the elevation of Sennacherib to the throne of Assyria, it will at once account for the absence of his name from the Assyrian archives, and the consequent silence of Ctesias on the subject, and will restore the harmony which has hitherto been observed between the Greek and Hebrew histories. And we find recorded many circumstances which strongly favour this view of the case. It is evident from many parts of the Scripture, that during the short reign of Sennacherib, the affairs of Assyria were in a very troubled and confused state. The Assyrian armies were destroyed before Jerusalem. Media was a prey to anarchy and revolt; and rebellion raged within the walls of Nineveh, till Sennacherib himself fell a victim to its fury. This state of affairs would naturally be seized on by the neighbouring nations to assert and establish their own independence. The Medes raised themselves into a kingdom, and the Babylonians<sup>1</sup> (who we know were subject to Shalmaneser—they had probably been subdued by Tiglath-pileser<sup>2</sup>) sent messengers to Hezekiah, king of Judah, as if they wished to make a league against the common enemy. If, then, we suppose that the elevation of Sennacherib to the throne of Assyria was violent and illegal, and was, therefore, not recorded in the chronicles of the kings of Nineveh, we shall find the difficulties of our subject removed, and may proceed with the comparison of the lists of the remaining kings of Assyria, according to the Greek and Hebrew accounts. The Esarhaddon of Scripture, will be regarded as the legitimate successor of Shalmaneser, and will thus be identified with the Artæus of Ctesias. This prince appears to have been of a quiet and peaceful disposition. Little is said of him in Hebrew history, except that he appears to have tacitly admitted the independence of the Medes. And the only event which the Greeks have recorded to mark his long reign of forty years, is the revolt of the provinces bordering on Media, and the total defeat of the imperial armies, by a body of rebels in the hills of Cadasia.

Artæus was succeeded on the throne by Artynas, the last of the descendants of the great Arbaces, recorded by Ctesias. His

<sup>1</sup> 2 Kings xxvii. 21.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Kings xx. 12.

reign is made to cease from the time of the accession of Cyaxares the Mede to the throne of Media; for though there were kings of Assyria for more than thirty years after that event, still, as Cyaxares destroyed Nineveh, and transferred to himself the sceptre of the Assyrians, he would naturally stand in the chronological list of the sovereigns of Upper Asia, to the exclusion of the kings whom he conquered and destroyed. Now this Artæus, who succeeded Esarhaddon, must have been that warlike king of Assyria who defeated Phraortes, king of the Medes, the Arphaxad of Judith, and must, therefore, be identified with the Nebuchadonosor of Hebrew history, who, "after having defeated and taken Arphaxad, in the mountains of Reigan, and smote him through with his darts," sent forth Holofernes, the chief captain of his army, which was next to him, "with an overwhelming force, and ordered him to go against the West country, and to be avenged on the coasts of Cilicia, and Damascus, and Syria, and that he would slay with the sword all the inhabitants of the land of Moab, and the children of Ammon, and all Judea, and all that were in Egypt, till ye come to the borders of the Two Seas, because they had disobeyed his commandments," when he summoned them to join him in his late campaign against the Medes. On the success of this expedition, history is silent; but it is highly probable that it was short and disastrous. For we learn from Judith, that Holofernes was killed, and his army, the élite of the Assyrian troops, defeated before the walls of Bethulia. The loss of this army explains the weakness in the Assyrian empire, of which Cyaxares took advantage, by invading the kingdom, as related by Herodotus. The sway of the once great kings of Assyria was already confined to the walls of Nineveh, when they were saved from ruin, though exposed to a fresh insult, by the incursion of a horde of Sythians, from the banks of the Tanaïs, who overthrew all that opposed their advance, drove Cyaxares into the hills of Media, and enjoyed for a period of twenty-eight years undisputed possession of Upper Asia. Nineveh, itself, does not appear to have suffered from their attacks. The indiscriminate rapacity of these barbarians would be amply satiated on the spoils of the fertile provinces of Assyria, and would render them as indispensed as they were ill-prepared to waste their time in the tedious and unaccustomed operations of a siege. But twenty-eight years of luxury and indolence impaired their native strength and spirit. They fled in their turn before the armies of Cyaxares, and Nineveh was again exposed to his attacks. About the year *n. c.* 605, the capital of the East fell before the combined power of the Babylonians and the Medes. And the Assyrian name, and the Assyrian power, which

had flourished for 1,600 years, was cast down and destroyed for ever.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The utter destruction of the most powerful nations and cities of antiquity, is a striking feature in the history of the world. They appear to have been destroyed by a moral deluge, which has scarce left a vestige of their former existence. The history of Assyria, and the destruction of Nineveh, may be cited as illustrative of this remark. The early history of this once great capital is buried in the darkness of extreme antiquity.—According to the Scriptures, it was founded by Ashur, the son of Shem, the son of Noah, about twenty-three centuries before the Christian era. According to Ctesias and the Greek historians, it was built by Ninus, in the twenty-second century B.C. The Greek, however, tells us that Ninus was not the first king of Assyria: we may, therefore, suppose him to have been the son or the grandson of Ashur, which will reconcile the slight difference between the two accounts. From this early age, we have no account of the capital of Assyria, till the time of the Arbacidæ, in the ninth century before the Christian era, under whom we may suppose it attained its highest state, splendour, and prosperity. About the year B.C. 605, Nineveh was taken and destroyed by Cyaxares. But its fine situation on the banks of the Tigris, in the midst of the most fertile parts of Assyria, would make it the abode of the merchant and husbandman, although it was no longer the capital of an empire. Accordingly we find it mentioned by Ptolemy, (L. xii.) Tacitus, (An. 13,) Dion Cassius, and others, as holding a place in their time among the cities of Assyria; and Ammianus Marcellinus (xxviii. 7,) speaks of it as a large place, so late as the middle of the fourth century of the Christian era. But the incursions of the Huns, in the fifth century, and the wars of Justinian and Noshirwan, in the sixth, would render the fertile banks of the Tigris ill-adapted for the operations of agriculture or commerce. And we are, therefore, not surprised to find, that in the year 627, the armies of Heraclitus contended with the Persians for the empire of Assyria, on the ground where the capital of Ninus had stood. In the words of the prophecy denounced against her, “She had become a desolation, and dry—like a wilderness—a place for beasts to lie in.” Since that period, Nineveh, like Babylon, has remained desolate. Still, in her desolation, she has retained the vestiges of her former greatness. The ruins of her walls, and towers, and palaces, lie along the Tigris, more like the works of nature than of man; and offer, in the silent solitude of the desert, an eloquent example of worldly vicissitudes, but an imperishable monument of the grandeur and magnificence of the capital of Assyria. And the fate of Ecbatana is no less striking; were it not that its position is determined by the accounts of ancient writers, there is little to show us, that the modern open town Hamadan, is the remains of the once magnificent Ecbatana; the town which Semiramis adorned with aqueducts; which Deioeces encircled with a sevenfold wall; which the successors of Alexander, and the Parthian kings long preserved as a royal city. Dochart has advanced a strange opinion respecting the derivation of the word Ecbatana. Alluding to the sevenfold wall of Deioeces, each wall of which is said to have been of a different colour, he observes:—“Ab hæc colorum varietate putaverim Ecbatana dicta, quia Arabicè hodie عَکْبَتَانِ id ipsum significat. Giggæus אֶלְעֶבֶת Al Aghatha, vario colore distinctus fuit.” Now, setting aside the question of an Arabic derivation for a Median town, I would observe, that Agbatha اَعْمَث does not mean “parti-coloured,” but “dust or brick-coloured.” Thus, according to the Kamûs, it means اَبْعَث dust-coloured, whence a lion is called اَبْعَث from his colour. So

Before taking leave of the subject, I cannot omit to notice another striking agreement between the accounts of the Greeks and the Persians, in regard to the period to which they refer the establishment of the Persian and Assyrian kingdoms. When the infant colonies of the descendants of Noah spread themselves abroad in separate parties to seek for a place wherein to settle, it is reasonable to suppose that the same causes, whatever may have been their nature or origin, which led to the institution of a sovereign authority in any one tribe or society, would have led to a similar result in another, if similarly situated, at no very distant period of time. When, therefore, we find accounts in two different and distinct histories, which fix the establishment of the sovereign authority in two neighbouring kingdoms of the highest antiquity, at nearly the same period of time, it must be admitted that the conformity of the two, is an argument in favour of the truth of them both. According to Ctesias, the empire of Assyria was founded by Ninus, more than 1300 years before the revolt of Arbaces the Mede, which occurred, as we have seen, in the year B.C. 821. And this places the establishment of the Assyrian monarchy in the twenty-second century before the Christian era. According to Firdousi, the Paishdadian dynasty had been on the throne 800 years before the invasion of the Tazis, under Zohák, which event we have above referred to the year B.C. 1341, which gives for the establishment of the Persian monarchy the year B.C. 2141,<sup>1</sup> twenty years only before the year assigned by the Greeks to Ninus, and these accounts are strikingly borne out by Hebrew history. From the Hebrew Bible we learn that the earth was divided in the time of Peleg, who was fourth in descent from Shem, the son of Noah. Now Peleg was born in the second century after the deluge, which, according to the chronology of the Hebrew Bible,<sup>2</sup> was the twenty-second century before the Christian era; the

Meninski renders it, on the authority of the Wan Kuli, "*Pulverulento quasi colore præditus*," and the Persian lexicographers represent it as a colour produced by mixing black and red, which we all know produces a brown.

<sup>1</sup> The foundation of the Egyptian monarchy may also be referred to the same period. The accession of Menes, the first king of Egypt whose reign appears to be authentic, is fixed about the latter end of the twenty-third century B.C. Eusebius places it in the year B.C. 2258; Julius Africanus in 2210. (See *Isaies, Analysis of Ancient Chronol.*) Dr. Pritchard gives the year 2214 for the same event. (See *Egyptian Antiquities*.)

<sup>2</sup> According to the Chronology of the Hebrew Bible, as calculated by Usher, the Deluge occurred 2348 years before the Christian era. Playfair makes it 2351. A much longer period is assigned by the Greek and Samaritan versions, which I consider to be incorrect.

very century to which the Greeks and Persians refer the establishment of the ancient empires of Persia and Assyria. And there is another circumstance worthy of being noted. Peleg, according to the Hebrew history, was the son of Eber, the son of Salah, the son of Arphaxad, the son of Shem. Kaiomars, the first king of Persia, was, according to the author of the *Jehán Ará*, the son of Delawad, the son of Amín, the son of Arphaxad, the son of Shem, which makes him exactly cotemporary with Peleg, "in whose time the earth was divided." I consider Ninus to have been cotemporary with Kaiomars, to whom Assyria was allotted in the division of the earth. He was probably the grandson of Ashur, the son of Shem, from whom his kingdom was called the Assyrian.

*Bombay, April, 1836.*

---

## PART II.

### ON THE FATE OF THE TEN TRIBES OF ISRAEL AFTER THE FALL OF SAMARIA.

"AND God stirred up the spirit of Pul, king of Assyria, and Tiglath-pileser, king of Assyria, and he carried them away, (even the Reubenites, and the Gadites, and the half-tribe of Manasseh,) and brought them unto Halah, and Habor, and Hara, and to the river Gozan, unto this day."—1 CHRON. v. 26.

"And in the ninth year of Hoshea, the king of Assyria (Shalmaneser) took Samaria, and carried Israel away captive into Assyria, and placed them in Halah, and in Habor by the river Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes."—2 KINGS xvii. 6.

Such are the accounts which history has preserved of the destruction of the Hebrew kingdom of Samaria, and of the carrying away into captivity the ten tribes of Israel by Pul, Tiglath-pileser, and Shalmaneser, the kings of Assyria. The statement itself is distinct and indisputable, but involves two questions in addition to those already discussed, which are still obscured by much doubt and uncertainty. These questions are, first, "Where were the captive Israelites deposited?" and second, "Where are, or what has become of their descendants?" The consideration of these questions is the subject of the present part of this inquiry.

Now in order to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion on the first of the questions above stated, it is highly necessary that we clearly understand those passages of scripture from which is derived all our information regarding the subject now under discussion.<sup>1</sup> It will be seen by a reference to the several versions of the Hebrew text, that commentators and translators are by no means unanimous as to what is the true meaning of the passages in question. And since to every impartial inquirer, it must be a matter of considerable importance to know the exact sense of the original, to ascertain what the names preserved in Scripture are intended to represent, whether towns, or countries, or districts, or rivers, before he can proceed to identify them with places now existing, or preserved in authentic works on geography, I will offer a few brief observations on what I conceive to be the meaning conveyed in the words of the Hebrew Bible.

There are two passages in the English version which I cannot but regard as decidedly objectionable. The first of these is in the 1 Chron. v. 26, where the words גֹּזָן נָחַר are rendered "the river Gozan," from which it would seem that Gozan is to be understood as the name of a river. But in Hebrew the two substantives are placed in construction, as is shown by the punctuation, and therefore the latter must be, as we say, in the genitive case. According to this the passage would be rendered the "River of Gozan," making Gozan the name of a town or country; and this view of the question is supported by other passages of Scripture, in which Gozan is mentioned as the name of a place. Thus, in 2 Kings xix. 12, Sennacherib alludes to it as one of the *places* which his ancestors had reduced. "Have the gods of the nations delivered them which my fathers had destroyed, as Gozan and Haran?" &c. From all which it must, I think, be inferred, that Gozan was the name of a town or country, and not of a river, as would appear from the reading in the English Bible.

<sup>1</sup> The following is a specimen of the discrepancy between the several translations:—

1. Septuagint.—Καὶ κατοίκησεν αὐτοὺς ἐν Ἑλλάς καὶ ἐν Ἀβωρ ποτάμοις Γώζαν καὶ ὄρη Μήδων.
2. Vulgate.—Posuitque eos in Hala, et in Habor, juxta fluvium Gozan, in civitatibus Medorum.
3. Chaldee Paraphrase.—Et collocavit eos in Hahlah, et in Habor, fluvio Gozan, et urbibus Madai.
4. Arabic Paraphrase, (Translation) with which the Syriac agrees.—Et habitare fecit illos in Hilah, et in Habor, fluminis Gozan, &c.

The other passage to which I object, is in 2 Kings xvii. 6. The text is **בְּהַבּוֹר נָהָר נָחַן**, which is rendered in the English Bible "Habor, by the river of Gozan," where the particle "by" is introduced without authority,<sup>1</sup> there being nothing to correspond therewith in the original. The interpretation is simply, and cannot with propriety be other than this, "To the Habor, the river of Gozan," which, as we have seen, was a town or country.

As regards "Halah," there are no means for ascertaining precisely whether it is the name of a town or of a river. It may in both passages be understood as either; but from the manner in which it is coupled with the Habor, where that is called the river of Gozan, I should rather be induced to regard it as a river. The Greek translation called the Septuagint, seems to take this for granted, and renders the passage *ἐν Ἀλαε καὶ ἐν Ἀβωρ ποτάμους Γώζαν*, "about the Halah, and about the Habor, rivers of Gozan," which, although it is not a literal version, must I think be regarded as substantially correct.

As to Hara, it may be observed that there is some controversy about this name. Usher reads it Haran, and identifies it with the Haran of Genesis xi. 31, and of 2 Kings xix. 12, in which place it is also, as in the present instance, associated with Gozan. I am therefore disposed to assent to the opinion of the learned prelate above mentioned, especially as some Arabs, to whom I have mentioned the name Hara, have not hesitated to identify it with the well-known Haran of Mesopotamia; I think it not unlikely, that, at some period of its history, this town was known by the name of Hara, for the Greeks and Romans always wrote it *Χάρραι*, and Charraë, which would hardly have been done had the place been called Haran, with the final *N*. as fully sounded, as in the ancient Hebrew and modern Arabic names.

These remarks will suffice to show how in my opinion the passages before us *ought* to be understood and translated. I will therefore proceed to make some remarks on the opinions which are at present generally entertained regarding the situation of those places

<sup>1</sup> The cause of the introduction of this particle is obvious. By the literal interpretation, "Habor, the River of Gozan," Habor is identified with the river of Gozan; to which it was objected, that in the other passage above quoted from 1 Chron. v. 26, Habor and the river Gozan are separately mentioned, as two different localities. But when it is considered, as will be shown in the sequel, that the Habor is actually the river of Gozan, and also that a town and district in the vicinity of that river are known by the same name, it will be evident that the liberty taken with the text is as needless as it is improper.



to which the captives of Israel were carried, and to show the insufficiency and inconclusiveness of the arguments upon which they are generally supported. It would be a task as useless as uninteresting, to take a review of the several opinions of the many writers on this controverted question; and as the objections I have to make apply not so much to the details of any particular case, as to the method which has been pursued in all, I will confine my remarks to a single example, and for this will select the hypothesis of Bochart, in consequence of the publicity it has generally acquired from having been adopted, in toto, by Wells in his *Geography of the Bible*, and by Patrick in his *Commentary on the Old Testament*, in reliance on the opinion of that celebrated Orientalist.

According to Bochart, the captives from Israel were carried to Calachena,<sup>1</sup> a town in the N. E. of the Assyrian empire; to Chaboras, a mountain, and Gauzania, a town still further to the north, in the direction of the Caspian, and to Aria, which he supposes to be put for Media, that is to say, towards the modern provinces of Azarbijan and Khorasan. It appears that the grounds on which Bochart has proceeded to identify these places with those mentioned in Scripture are, first, a certain similarity in name, and secondly, the circumstance of their being, as he makes them, "Cities of the Medes." With regard to the latter part of the argument, which appears to have been regarded as a point of great importance with almost every one who has written on the subject, it is necessary to observe, that there is nothing whatever in the Scripture accounts from which it can be argued that the places there mentioned must be regarded as identical with the cities of the Medes. The copulative conjunction does not require that the things which it is applied to connect together, should be identical or synonymous with each other. On the contrary, if any argument can be drawn from a grammatical analysis of the passage in the text, it would be that Halah and Habor, &c., were other places than cities of the Medes; for a conjunction joins things not identical but different. With regard, however, to the similarity in name, not only is this incomplete and far-fetched, but, supposing it to be much more perfect than it is, we should find that it would not of itself be an argument to establish the identity of any one particular place, with any of those mentioned in Scripture history. For in the maps of the old Assyrian empire, and in the

<sup>1</sup> It is obvious that Calachena is a very different word from Halah, and we have no authority for identifying the mountain Chaboras of Bochart with the Habor of Scripture, which is said to have been a town or river. The objection is less with regard to Gauzania, except that the Gozan of Scripture history is said to be

very same pages of Ptolemy's Geography which contain the names which Bochart has selected, we find Cuberasa, Chalcis, Gasina, and Coana; and of Chaboras, Chalcitis, Gauzania and Charræ; of Colchis, Iberia, and many others which bear a resemblance at least as near to those in our text, as the mountain Chaboras, Calachena, Gauzania, and Aria, above mentioned. It is evident, therefore, that a mere similarity is not of itself by any means conclusive, in favour of any particular place; there must be a probability on other grounds (as well as this, which is also necessary), the want of which, in my opinion, constitutes a great and fundamental objection to the arguments of Bochart, and of every other writer on the subject.

We have seen that at the time of the capture of Samaria, not long before the elevation of Kaikobad, the Persian monarchy was in a state of utter anarchy and confusion, subject to constant inroads from the tribes of Turán, who were only checked by the conduct of Zál, and the gallant chiefs and warriors of Seistán. It is, therefore, improbable, as opposed to the whole tenour of Persian history, to suppose that at that period a king of Assyria would have meddled at all in the affairs of the north-eastern provinces of Persia, particularly as we learn from Hebrew history, that so much of the attention of the Assyrian armies was turned at that time towards the kingdoms in the west, which afforded, it is probable, not only a more easy, but a more valuable conquest, than could be wrested from the warlike tribes in the north. It is no less improbable that a king of Assyria should have carried away a whole nation of captives, across countries so arid and so difficult to traverse as the plains of Mesopotamia, and the rugged mountains to the north of Assyria, to place them in the remote and turbulent provinces now known as Azarbijan, Khorassan, and Seistan. Nor is this objection much diminished, if we admit the supposition of Rennell and others, that

situated near the river Habor, whereas the stream which flowed by Gauzania, is known in the pages of ancient history by no other name than that of Cyrus. However we have no authority for supposing that Aria was the ancient name of Media. It is, indeed, asserted by some geographers, that the Medes were once called *'Apori*, *Arians*, as were our ancestors once called Saxons and Normans, &c. But it is nowhere said that the country of the Medes was ever known by the name of Aria. We are indeed told by the Whistons (Annotat. in Moses Chorenensis Hist. Armen.) that the name is derived from a word signifying, "Bold, Courageous," which would account for the Medes being called *Arians*, but would not authorize the assumption that their country was called Aria, and might therefore be identified with the Hara of Scripture. The Aria of the ancients lay to the east of the province of Khorasan, in the direction of the Seistan of the modern Persians, which is famous from having been the principality of Zál, and the great heroes of Persian history, who lived, as has been shown, about the time of the captivity of Israel.

a *portion* of the nation of Israel only, consisting of fighting-men, artificers, &c., were carried away captive into Assyria. But this opinion is purely conjectural, and opposed to the whole tenour of Scripture history. Other objections might also be advanced against the hypothesis now under discussion, but as I have said that I object chiefly, not so much to any one hypothesis in particular, as to the insufficient grounds on which they all are established, I will not dwell on this point any longer, but proceed to point out those localities to which it seems probable that a king of Assyria would, in the then state of the Assyrian empire, have carried a nation whom he had expelled from Samaria.

It has already been shown, in the preceding part of this inquiry, that Arbaces the Mede ascended the ancient throne of Nineveh about the year 821 before the era of our redemption; and that he was succeeded by Mandaucæ, who died about the year 773. These two princes we have already identified with the Feridûn and Menucheher of Persian history; and have shown, from a comparison of the several records which treat on the subject, that it is as evident as it is probable, that the latter prince pursued the common policy of Oriental conquerors, by dividing his empire among his sons, and that, therefore, the histories of Persia and of Assyria are henceforth to be regarded as separate and distinct. Mandaucæ was succeeded in Assyria by Sosarmus, and this prince and his successors, Artycas and Arbianes, must be identified, as we have seen, with the Pul, Tiglath-pilneser, and Shalmaneser, of the Hebrews.<sup>1</sup> We are distinctly informed in the sacred history, that Tiglath-pilneser, not long before the invasion of Israel, had conquered Syria, and carried away the inhabitants in bondage to Assyria. And we are likewise told that, on the reduction of Samaria, Shalmaneser brought men from Babylon and Cuthah, and the adjoining countries, to place in the lands of the children of Israel.<sup>2</sup> Now we learn from Ctesias, that

<sup>1</sup> 2 Kings xvi. 9.

<sup>2</sup> "And the king of Assyria brought men from Babylon and from Cuthah, and from Avah, and from Sepharvaim, and placed them in the cities of Samaria, instead of the children of Israel."—2 Kings, xvii. 24.

With regard to these places, they may still be traced in the countries adjoining Mesopotamia and Assyria. Babylon is well known. Cuthah, כּוּתָּה, is still preserved. Thus the Kamoos كوثي قريه بالعراق "Cutha is a town in Irák, or Babylonia." Avah אַוָּא is, I imagine, the Auchenitis regio of the ancients, situated above Babylon, on the right bank of the Euphrates. (Nitis is an affix, which subtracted leaves Auchia, which is perhaps the nearest form by which the Greeks and Romans could represent the guttural sound contained in the Hebrew

on the elevation of Arbaces, the province of Babylon was awarded to Belesys, as an independent principality, to be held by him, without the payment of tribute, as the price of his assistance in the revolution by which Sardanapalus was deposed. It is, therefore, evident that the kings of Assyria could not have interfered with the affairs of Babylon, unless in their career of conquest in the west, under the warlike successors of Arbaces, they had invaded and reduced that country also, when they would naturally pursue the same course with its inhabitants, which we are informed that they adopted towards the Israelites and Syrians. We read, moreover, in the blasphemous message of Sennacherib to Hezekiah, king of Judah, that Haran also, and the adjoining parts of Upper Asia, had fallen before the tide of Assyrian invasion, from which we may infer that the inhabitants of that part of the country also, shared the common fate of a conquered province, and were driven in exile to a foreign country. The devastating influence of such wars, and such a policy, in a region so arid as that part of Mesopotamia, would have left a desert between the Tigris and Euphrates, which could not have been crossed by a whole nation of captives, but which it was the obvious policy of the Assyrians to restore to cultivation, by the introduction of a colony from a foreign land. Had people been brought from Babylon or Assyria, the immediate vicinity of their native country would afford them too great facilities for escape. The same objection would have made it unsafe to leave the Israelites in Damascus, and the adjoining cities of Syria. And hence we must conclude, that Mesopotamia was the place, to which it is most probable that a considerable portion of the captives of Samaria were driven in bondage by the kings of Assyria.

In the well-known geographical work of Edrisi, it is stated,<sup>1</sup> that name.) Hamath, **המת** is preserved without variation in the Syrian town of Hamah, or Hamat. **حماة** and Sipharvaim **ספרוים** may be traced in the Siphara of Ptolemy, situated in Babylonia, not far above Babylon. Sipharvaim, it may be remarked, is in the dual number; the singular is Siphara, or Sipharva. The Siphara of the Greeks lay on the left bank of the Euphrates, and, it is probable that the district extended to the opposite bank of the river; hence, being divided into two portions, it would with propriety be called Sipharvaim, or the two Sipharas.

<sup>1</sup> The words of the Geographer are,—

و من الخابور الي قرقيسه مرحلتان و قرقيسه مدينة بالجانب الشرقي من الفرات و يصب السفلى الهرماس المسمى بالخابور  
 “And from Al Habor to Karkasiah is two marches; and Karkasiah is a town on the east bank of the Euphrates, and under it flows the Hermas, commonly called Al Habor.”

about 250 miles west of Bagdad, near the left bank of the river Euphrates, stands the town of Al Habor, *الخابور* and that two marches further to the westward is a river, the only one of size in Mesopotamia, which comes down from the north, and falls into the Euphrates, at Karkasiah, the Circesium of the Roman geographers. The name of this river is Hermas, *الهرماس* but says our author *المسمى بالخابور* it is generally called by the name of Al Habor, which name, he also tells us, is extended to the district, stretching for miles along the banks of the river. Not many miles west of the source of this stream, stands the ruined, but well-known town of Haran *حاران* or Hara, the *Χαῤῥαι* and Charræ of the ancient geographers. About fifty miles from Karkasiah, up the Habor, at its junction with another stream, stands the town of Naharain, *نهراین* or, "the Town of the Two Rivers." The one is the Habor, which flows down to Naharain from a westerly direction. The other is called Al Hâlih *الحالي* and Halah by the Arabs, and the country on its bank is called by Ptolemy Gauzanitis *Γαυζανίτις*. When, therefore, in the very places where we have seen it is most probable that the Israelites were deposited, we find every name recorded in Scripture so little changed in the lapse of centuries, we may, I think, rest satisfied, that we have ascertained the locality in which the captives from Samaria were placed.

It remains, then, to notice "the cities of the Medes," of which a general mention only has been recorded, as if they were places more remote and less known than Haran, and the neighbouring parts of Mesopotamia, and which cannot, I think, be properly understood in any but a plain and literal sense,—that part of the captives were carried into Media. It is distinctly stated in the history of Tobit, that in the times immediately subsequent to the capture of Samaria, several families of the Israelites were settled about Nineveh, and in Rages, and Ecbatana, and other cities of Media; and even had this evidence not been preserved, a consideration of what was the obvious policy of the Assyrians, would lead us to suppose that some such distribution of the captives would be made. Experience had shown

It appears that the Jews of Mesopotamia entertain an idea, that these are the sites to which the captives of Samaria were carried. And it is remarked by the Rabbi David ben Hillel, in his travels through Mesopotamia, that, "about two hours' distance from Nisibin, I passed a small river which the Israelites call Halah, which comes from the mountains. The Arabs call it Al Hali. It appears to me that it is the same river which is mentioned in 2 Kings xvii. 6. because it is very near the cities of the Medes, and the river Hôvor is not far from it."

them that misfortune and adversity could not reduce the proud spirit of the children of Israel; a three years' siege of Samaria bore witness to the obstinate nature of their courage; and it is, therefore, not likely that the conquerors would introduce them into the heart of the Assyrian empire, without taking the precaution of breaking those bonds of union and nationality, on which the strength of the Israelites so vitally depended, for which no means could be more easy and more effectual than the dividing them among the districts of Mesopotamia and Media, with the armies of Nineveh interposed between them.

We have thus arrived at the second question proposed for consideration, as to what has become of the descendants of the captives: a point on which history is unfortunately silent. Had there been only one dispersion of the children of Israel, we might have been enabled, with less data than we actually possess, by the sole means of physiognomy and language, to trace their descendants among the nations of the earth, or be certain that the objects of our search were no more. But in the case before us, we require some means to distinguish the objects of our inquiry, from those of the same nation, who were subsequently carried off, or dispersed in all directions, when Jerusalem was taken by Nebuchadnezzar, and subsequently by the armies of the Roman emperors. But history is silent, language and physiognomy are evidently ineffectual, and there is, therefore, nothing to which we can look, to guide us in the wilds of speculation and conjecture, but the faint and uncertain glimmer of tradition.

But in this instance, tradition fails us; for we do not know of a tribe or people, who have preserved a tradition, or of whom a tradition has been preserved by others, that they are descended from the captives of Israel.<sup>1</sup> But since there are certain opinions and speculations, which have obtained from the great names with which they are associated, a considerable degree of publicity and belief, although they are devoid of any real foundation, it may be satisfactory, while treating on the subject, to take them briefly into consideration.

The opinion which has gained most general notoriety, from the manner in which it has been advanced by Sir W. Jones, is that

<sup>1</sup> I should perhaps except the modern Samaritans, or Sichemites, who claim descent from Ephraim and Manasseh. "We believe in Moses, and in Mount Gerizim. We have priests of the race of Levi, descended in a right line from Aaron and Phineas. We are all of the tribe of Joseph, by Ephraim and Manasseh, and of the tribe of Levi; our habitation is in the Holy City of Sicheim al Gaza." See Letter addressed by the Sichemites to the Jews of England.—BASNAGE.

which supposes the fierce tribes of Afghanistan to be the descendants of the captives of Samaria. Now it is to be observed, that in the histories and traditions of the Afgháns, upon which it is supposed that this opinion is established, there is no mention whatever of Samaria, or of the Assyrians. On the contrary, according to their own traditions, the Afgháns are descended from the captives of Jerusalem, who were taken, when their country was overrun by Nebuchadnezzar, and placed about Ghour and Kaudahar, whence they took their present name, from one Afghana, a son of Saul, from whose family they claimed descent. Now it is clear, that this story, supposing it to be authentic, does not warrant the conclusion that the Afgháns are the descendants of the captives of Samaria. And there are no other traditions whatever on the subject; nor other grounds upon which this hypothesis can be supported. So that it is, in fact, opposed to those very histories and legends, upon which alone it rests for its support.

Another opinion, is that which has been advanced by Major Rennell, in his *Geography of Herodotus*, where he states, on the authority of Josephus and Abulfeda, that there were, in ancient times, several settlements of Jews scattered throughout Media and the adjoining provinces; and one in particular, which was called Jahúdia, which he supposes to have been established by the captives of Samaria. Now the settlement, as is stated, was called Jahúdia, or the Place of the Jews; and this is an argument that the captives of Judah, not those of Israel, were the original founders of these Jewish colonies; as the Israelites would never have called a town which they founded, by the name of that tribe from which they had separated, and with whom they were engaged in constant hostility. Had the inhabitants of these early settlements called themselves Israelites, or children of Israel, an argument might be found in favour of this opinion; but as it is, the argument is against it.

Another opinion, and which I myself have heard expressed by well-informed Jews, both of India and Arabia, is founded on a tradition, which seems to be current among the Jews in the East, that the ten tribes of Israel are still in existence, somewhere beyond a river which they call "the river of tribes," which they say is situated in a north-easterly direction, beyond the confines of Tartary and of China. Although it is probable that this opinion rests on no other, or no better foundation, than the belief entertained so fondly by the Jews, that their kingdom will be restored on the advent of the Messiah, when the lost tribes will be brought back, and re-established in Jerusalem, it is curious nevertheless, and worthy of attention, from

its conformity with an opinion once so generally received, which would derive the several tribes of North American Indians, from an Hebrew origin.<sup>1</sup> It is certain, and for the cause of knowledge it is to be regretted, that when the idea of tracing the wanderers of Israel to the wilds of the new world first suggested itself to the early settlers in America, it was, from its novelty, and the great interest of its subject, of a nature too calculated to seize upon the imagination, and to enlist the wishes of the pious and contemplative

<sup>1</sup> The idea of the Hebrew origin of the North American Indians, which was advocated so warmly by the early settlers in the new world, appears of late to be very generally disregarded, or to be looked on as an idle and visionary speculation, the mere offspring of the enthusiasm and imagination. That men who were excited by the interest of the subject, should fancy some analogies and points of resemblance, where others, who were indifferent, or perhaps incredulous, were unable to perceive, or unwilling to admit them, is too much in accordance with human nature to excite our surprise. But to say that the several facts and arguments which have been adduced by so many different authors in support of this opinion, are nothing more than the effects of imagination, is a bare assertion against positive testimony, a mode of reasoning too unphilosophical to satisfy the mind of the most superficial inquirer. The idea of the Hebrew origin of the North American Indians, was entertained by almost all the first ministers who settled in New England, as early as the middle of the sixteenth century. It appears to have been first suggested to John Elliot, (the Indian Evangelist, as he is deservedly called,) by a Mr. Winslow, the agent in New England of the Massachusetts colony, about the year 1649; and was communicated as the opinion of a learned Jew, named Rabbi ben Israel. It was subsequently maintained by several other writers on the subject, and supported by arguments drawn from several striking peculiarities, which characterise the manners, customs, religion, usages, and physiognomy of the North American Indians. These writers are far too numerous to be quoted, but the report of Mr. Blome and Cotton Mather's "*Magnalia Christi Americana*," published in the seventeenth century, and the work of Adair in the eighteenth, though not altogether free from objections, will suffice to show the general opinion of the age in which these writers lived. In later times the subject has been treated by Dr. Bodinot, in his "*Star in the West*," in which he has applied to it the interpretation of the dream contained in 2 Esdras xiii. 39, *et seq.*, which contains these remarkable words:—"And whereas thou sawest that he gathered another peaceable multitude unto him; those are the ten tribes which were carried away prisoners out of their own land, in the time of Osea, the king, whom Salmanassar, the king of Assyria, led away captive, and he carried them over the waters; and so came they into another land. But they took this counsel among themselves, that they would leave the multitude of the heathen, and go forth into a further country where never mankind dwelt. That they might there keep their statutes, which they never kept in their own land. And they entered unto Euphrates, by the narrow passages of the river. For the Most High then showed signs for them, and held still the flood till they were passed over. For through that country, there was a great way to go, namely of a year and a half; and the same region is called *Arsareth*," &c. The last writer on the subject is Colton. And in these authors may be found perhaps all that can be said on the question.



in the establishment of its probability, to be dispassionately and fairly viewed; "we are, therefore, (to use the words of Jervis on this subject,) constantly led to suspect the fidelity of the statements of these early writers, because their judgments had lost their equipoise, and they saw everything through a discoloured medium." But it is equally to be regretted, that those who thought proper to reject these hypotheses, founded, as they appeared to be, on a number of positive facts and circumstances, did not think it necessary to give their reasons for so doing, or to enter into the exposition of the fallacy of those arguments, or the misstatement of those circumstances, upon which the opinion which they rejected appeared to be established. Instead of this, they seem to have been satisfied with a single argument; and on the grounds of an opinion that the language of the North American Indians was different and distinct from that of the Hebrews, they have abandoned the subject, as undeserving of further comment or consideration. As a general rule, it may be admitted, "that the most unequivocal method of ascertaining the origin of a people, is to examine with attention the character of their language, and to compare it with the languages of more ancient nations." But the history of some of the wandering tribes of the East, shows that this rule is not always to be relied on; and that the Parsees of India, are not the only people, who, having wandered, or been driven from their native land, have abandoned, entirely, the language of their ancestors, and adopted that of the country where they settled. If, therefore, it is true, as is so generally stated, that the Indians of North America have preserved in their physiognomy so strong a resemblance to the Jewish features, that, to use the quaint expression of an early writer, "a man would think himself in Duke's Place, or Bury Street, in London, when he seeth them;" if there are in the rites and ceremonies of their religion, so many points of conformity with the Jewish ritual, as are generally admitted—if the sacred character with which they invest the ark, or covered chest, which they carry in their expeditions is not grossly exaggerated, or utterly misstated—if they apply the Hebrew term, *A-loh-heem*, or "Gods," to the "Great Spirit," the name by which they call the Deity, and if "in their sacred songs and dances, *Hal-le-lu-yah* is often heard as perfectly as in a Christian choir;" and, to cite but one other point of resemblance, if their deep veneration for the word *Jehovah* resembles so nearly as is stated the awe with which the Hebrews regard the mysterious name *Jehovah*; the mere difference of language is not, in my opinion, sufficient to discredit their Hebrew origin, in opposition to the

testimony of so many circumstances, which cannot be attributed to chance or to accident.<sup>1</sup> From the traditions of the Jews who are scattered throughout China, we are informed that their ancestors were established in that country during the reign of the Han dynasty, which ascended the throne in the third century before the Christian era ; and there is nothing therefore extravagant or improbable, in supposing that in times as remote or more ancient, another body of the same people were driven from their settlements by the causes which impelled those who fled into China, and that, taking a somewhat more northerly course, they persevered in their wanderings till they reached the narrow channel between Asia and America, (supposing such a channel to have existed in those times,) which, whether they were seeking a more genial climate, or were fleeing from the attacks of the wild tribes of Tartary, they would have been equally desirous of crossing. Necessity may have compelled them to join themselves in intercourse with the tribes who preceded them in the occupation of America, till the language of their fathers fell into disuse, and nothing remained to bear witness to their descent, save the marks which nature has stamped upon their features, and those rites and ceremonies of the religion of their ancestors, which their ignorant superstition may have led them to retain, in the absence of any more inviting form of worship, long after the religion of which they were the symbols had been lost and forgotten in the stream of time. Still, however, supposing it were proved that the American Indians were of Hebrew descent, it would be of little use in our present inquiry. No certain argument could be adduced for assigning their origin to the captives of Samaria, rather than to the Jews who were driven from Jerusalem. Much less, in the absence of all record and tradition, can it be asserted that any traces of the ten tribes of Israel can be found among the Indians of North America.

The last opinion which has been advanced on the subject, is that of the well-known Dr. Wolff. He says that "In the year 1829, being then at Jerusalem, I said to my wife, Bochara and Balkh are very much in my mind, for I think I shall there find the ten tribes." In pursuance of this idea, he set off on his travels. On his arrival at Meshed, he found there several Jews, of whom he says, "that they protest against the name of Jew; they want to be called

<sup>1</sup> With regard to their language, Colton observes, that "the universal paramount requisition among them of the guttural organs in the use of their languages is a remarkable type of the Hebrew."

בני ישראל *i. e.*, Bení Israel, children of Israel." On arriving at Bokhara, he entered into discussion with the Jews of that place, and says, "Rabbi Gaday informed me that the old Rabbis of Bochara assert that Balkh and Bochara were the Habor and Halah of 2 Kings xvii. 6, and that the Ammoo, called also the Gihoon or Oxus, is the river Gozan, mentioned in the same chapter; that the Jews at Subzawar had been carried by some king to Samarkand, Balkh, and Bochara." The Mussulman moollas confirmed this opinion, by saying that Balkh was originally called Hanah, and subsequently Halah. He proceeds to say, "Some of the Jews say that the ten tribes are beyond China, and one must cross the Sumbatyon in order to reach them; but the river is very stormy through the whole week, excepting on the Sabbath-day. On the Sabbath, Gentiles were allowed to cross it, but not the Jews, for the ten tribes would say, Why do you transgress the law, by crossing the river on the Sabbath day? and would stone them, according to the Mosaical law. Though this is mixed with fiction, there is no doubt that some of the tribes are in China, as I hope to prove when I come to the narrative of my journey to Cashmere. The tradition already mentioned of the emigration of the children of Israel to Isheen-Patsheen, shows that some of the ten tribes must have been there, though I believe likewise the Bence Israel round and at Bombay, to be of the ten tribes. Rabbi Joseph ben Zachariah ben Mashah, from Sanaa in Yemen, now at Bochara, a very learned man, who speaks, as do all the Jews of Yemen, beautifully the Hebrew tongue, and also the Arabic language, tells me that the Bence Israel at Bancoot, near Bombay, are believed by the Jews of Yemen to be of the ten tribes." The opinion, then, of the missionary Wolff, appears to be (for it is not very clearly expressed), that the ten tribes are around Lassa, in Tibet and China. But the grounds on which this opinion is founded appear to be purely speculative, being nothing more than vague traditions not sufficient to set at rest, in a satisfactory manner, any part of the subject now under discussion. The followers of the law of Moses in Tibet and China *may* be Israelites, but there is nothing to show that they *are* not Jews.

Before quitting this part of the subject, I may notice the singular race of people above alluded to, who, though unquestionably of Hebrew descent, are distinguished from all others of the same family by certain peculiarities, so marked and singular, that they are well deserving of the attention of those who enjoy an opportunity of inquiring into their history. I allude to the people who are gene-

rally known as the Black Jews of Malabar.<sup>1</sup> By their own accounts, as far as I can learn, they arrived in India not long after the destruction of Jerusalem by the Roman armies under Titus; they say that the ships in which they had embarked were wrecked on the western coast of India; that a few of the men only escaped, who married women from the part of the country on which they were thrown, from whose offspring the present people are descended. It is, however, to be observed, that they call themselves Bení Israel, or children of Israel, and not Jews, the general name by which the followers of the law of Moses are, I believe, universally called. They declare, however, that they are Jews or Yahudi,<sup>2</sup> though for this I can find no other authority than their own assertion, founded on their wish to appear of the same caste or family with the Jews of Arabia, Syria, &c., by whom they are regarded with the utmost contempt. Moreover they differ in stature and physiognomy from the Jews of the other parts of Asia, from which and from other certain peculiarities, Dr. Buchanan found reason to believe "that they arrived in India many ages before the white Jews, who regard them as being of an inferior caste." The subject is one on which little is known, and is well deserving of investigation.

It is needless to dilate any further on this subject. The opinions above noticed are all which I am aware of, that have attained such a degree of authority and support, as to render any mention of them necessary or interesting. And when it is considered how slight are the foundations on which they are based, when the facts of the case, as above set forth, have been carefully attended to and fairly weighed, it must be admitted that the children of Israel have not been preserved as a separate body, and that it is vain and hopeless to seek for their descendants either in the present day, or anywhere within the reach of historical record. It is probable that many of them adhered religiously to the faith of their fathers, till the capture

<sup>1</sup> Others of them have a different story from what was told me. Wolff says, "I went with Mr. Stevenson among the few Bence Israel, children of Israel, who are resident at Poona. They are totally distinct from the rest of the Jews in Europe and Hindostan. Soon after the destruction of the first temple, they came in seven ships (thus they relate their own story,) from Arabia, into Hindostan, where they have since forgotten their law, but continue to repeat in Hebrew certain prayers. They have synagogues, but they have not in them, like the rest of the Jews, the Sephar Torah, or five books of Moses, written upon parchment."—*Researches*, p. 494.

<sup>2</sup> This, however, is not a general sentiment. I have reason to believe that a considerable part of them disclaim, in toto, the name of Jew, and maintain that they are not Yahudi, but Bení Israel.

of Jerusalem and the fall of Judah; and that then, when the Jews were scattered throughout Persia, and were, by the toleration of the Persian princes, allowed to form themselves into separate communities, or to return if they preferred it to their native land, we may suppose that the hopeless exile of Israel would endeavour to avail himself of the indulgence thus granted to his brethren of Judah; and as national animosity would be buried for the time beneath the weight of general calamity, they would gradually be incorporated in the tribe of Judah, and fall under the general denomination of Jews. Others, it is probable, returned in the course of time to Samaria, and joined themselves with the strangers whom the kings of Assyria had placed in the cities which were once their own. And it is likely that a great portion lapsed into idolatry, and became a part of the nation of their conquerors. "When the law was given in thunder from Mount Sinai, when the tides of the ocean and the course of the planets were suspended for the convenience of the Israelites; and when temporal rewards and punishments were the immediate consequence of their piety or disobedience, they perpetually lapsed into rebellion against the visible majesty of their divine King, placed the idols of the nations in the sanctuary of Jehovah, and imitated every fantastic ceremony that was practised in the tents of the Arabs, or the cities of Phœnicia." How then can we suppose that, when dispirited and without hope, captives in the hands of strangers and idolaters, they should refrain in their despair from the worship of those idols, to whose agency they attributed that power and success which the God whom they had insulted and forgotten in their prosperity had transferred to the enemies of their country and their religion? They were surrounded by countries closely allied to them by a common origin and a cognate dialect, from whom their religion and religious institutions alone kept them separate and distinct. The strictness and severity of the law of Moses, was not likely to be an object of preference with a people, in the bitter hours of servitude and exile, after they had so constantly slighted and rejected it, when they knew it was upheld by the hand of the Most High, and enforced by immediate and fearful punishment. They had not that cheering

<sup>1</sup> "And it shall come to pass, that as the Lord rejoiced over you to do you good, and to multiply you, so the Lord will rejoice over you to destroy you, and to bring you to nought. And ye shall be plucked from off the land whither thou goest to possess it. And the Lord shall scatter thee among all people, from the one end of the earth even to the other. And there thou shalt serve other gods, which neither thou nor thy fathers have known, even wood and stone."—Deuteronomy xxviii. 63, 64.

consolation afforded them, those manifestations of the divine power exercised in their behalf, which buoyed up the spirits of the captives of Judah during the period of their captivity. Prone to idolatry, and surrounded by temptation, a miracle alone could have upheld their belief, and that miracle was not vouchsafed them. They were left to the natural course of events, unchecked by further punishments, unsupported by a hope ; and their past history is enough to show how rapid and how general would be their fall into the superstitions and the idolatry of Assyria.

*Bombay, April, 1836.*

---